UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,995	06/21/2001	Scott J. Broussard	AUS920010266US1	5252

35617	7590	10/03/2003

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P.O. BOX 684908
AUSTIN, TX 78768

EXAMINER
MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _6-21-01_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-15_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

2.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The independent claims 1,6 and 13 and their dependent claims 2-5, 7-12 and 14-15 are based on eliciting certain actions from a second operating environment, different from the runtime operating environment. Since the present technology does not support running multiple operating environments in the same machine, then the system must be looked upon as a computer network in order to support more than one operating environment. The specification of this invention does not support any network.

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1,2,5,6,7,12,13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by David Curtis, "Java, RMI and CORBA", Copyright 1997 by Object

Management Group. (hereinafter Curtis).

6.   As per claim 1, Curtis shows a computer system, comprising:

        A runtime operating environment that comprises a computer processor and an

        operating system adapted to execute:

        A first object code portion containing instructions for eliciting certain actions from

        a Java virtual machine (JVM) associated with any of the plurality of operating

        environments (e.g. page 2, lines 1-9); A second object code portion containing

        instructions for eliciting certain actions from the operating system associated with

        the runtime operating environment; and first and second source code portions,

        wherein the first object code portion is derived from the first object code portion is

        derived from the first source code portion, the second object code portion is

        derived from the second source code portion, and wherein the second source

        code portion is adapted to derive a third object code portion containing

        instructions for eliciting certain actions from a second operating environment,

        different from the runtime operating environment (e.g. page 2, "Programming or

        Integration?", lines 1-20 and Figure 2).

7.   As per claim 6, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

8.   As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

9.   As per claim 2, wherein execution of the instructions contained within the first

and second object code portions may be initiated by a Java application program acting

within the runtime operating environment (e.g. page 2, lines 1-9 and figure 1-B).

10.   As per claim 7, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

11.   As per claim 5, Curtis shows a computer system wherein the second object code

portion comprises a host platform interface (HPI) between the AWT Component Peer

classes and the runtime operating environment (e.g. page 2, lines 1-9).

12.   As per claim 12, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

13.   As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 3,4,8-11and14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Curtis in view of Sun Microsystems, Inc. "The AWT Native Interface",

Copyright 1999 (hereinafter Sun).

16.   As per claim 3, Curtis does not show a system wherein the first source code

portion comprises definitions of Java abstract windowing toolkit (AWT) Component Peer

classes written in the Java programming language. Sun shows the source code portion,

which comprises of definitions of Java AWT (e.g. page 3 and 4, "MyCanvas class"

computer code). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to combine Curtis with Sun because it would provide for

creation of Java AWT Component Peer classes written in Java programming language.

17.   As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

18.   As per claim 9, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

19.   As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

20.   As per claim 4, Curtis does not show a system wherein the second source code

portion comprises definitions of native methods of Java AWT Component Peer classes

written in the C/C++ programming language. Sun shows the AWT native interface

written in C/C++ programming language (pages 6 and 7, Appendix). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine

Curtis and Sun to provide definitions of native methods of Java AWT in C/C++

programming language in order for the second source code portion definitions of native

methods of Java AWT Component Peer classes to be written in the C/C++

programming language.

21.   As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reason as stated above.

22.   As per claim 10, Curtis does not define native methods of Java AWT Component

Peer classes in the second source code portion. Sun defines the native methods of

Java AWT classes (e.g. pages 11 and 12, jawt_md.h, Windows 32 version). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine Curtis and Sun to provide a definition for native methods of Java AWT in

order to create a method further comprising defining native methods of Java AWT

Component Peer classes in the second source code portion.

Conclusion

23.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Using The Java Native Interface by S. Fouzi Husaini, The ACM's First Electronic

Publication, 2001.

Support for Extensions and Applications in the Version 1.2 of Java Platform, Sun

Microsystems, 1998.

Distributed Applications Management using Jini Connection Technology, Sun

Microsystems, 2000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-

8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-

5484.

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

fm